

STEVEN G. KALAR
Federal Public Defender
ELIZABETH M. FALK
Assistant Federal Public Defender
19th Floor Federal Building
450 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 436-7700

Counsel for Defendant DICKMAN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff,
v.
KRISTOPHER DICKMAN,
Defendant.

No. CR 12-0722 MMC

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
ORDER TO CONTINUE CHANGE OF
PLEA HEARING AND FOR
EXCLUDING TIME UNDER 18 U.S.C. §
3161 ; ORDER CONTINUING
HEARING TO SEPTEMBER 11, 2013**

The parties in this case agree and jointly request the Court to move the next status conference in the above captioned case from August 28, 2013 to September 4, 2013. The reason for this request is that defense counsel inadvertently consented by stipulation to a date for the next calling of the case for which she will be out of state.

The parties concur that granting the exclusion would allow the reasonable time necessary for continuity of counsel. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). The parties also agree that the ends of justice served by granting such an exclusion of time for the purposes of continuity of counsel outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A).

Accordingly, due to defense counsel's unavailability on August 28, 2013, the parties request that the Court move the change of plea hearing to September 4, 2013.

\\

1 SO STIPULATED:

2
3 MELINDA HAAG
United States Attorney

4
5 DATED: August 13, 2013

/s/
6 CAROLYN SILANE
Special Assistant United States Attorney

7
8 DATED: August 13, 2013

/s/
9 ELIZABETH FALK
Attorney for Defendant Kristopher Dickman

10
11
12 [PROPOSED] ORDER

13 For the reasons stated above the Court hereby CONTINUES the change of plea hearing in
14 the aforementioned case from August 28, 2014 to September 11,
15 September 4, 2013 at 2:15 p.m. The Court
16 further finds that the exclusion from the time limits of this period applicable under 18 U.S.C. §
17 3161 is warranted and that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best
18 interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. Denying the requested exclusion of
19 time would deprive the defendant of continuity of counsel, taking into account the exercise of
20 due diligence. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22
23 DATED: August 26, 2013.

24 
THE HONORABLE MAXINE M. CHESNEY
United States District Judge